

1 WILLIAM BLUMENTHAL
General Counsel

2 TRACY S. THORLEIFSON
3 MARY T. BENFIELD
Federal Trade Commission
4 915 Second Avenue, Suite 2896
Seattle, WA 98174
5 Phone: (206)220-6350
Facsimile: (206) 220-6366

6 BLAINE T. WELSH
7 Assistant United States Attorney
333 Las Vegas Blvd, South, Suite 5000
8 Las Vegas, NV 89101
Phone (702) 388-6336

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff
10 Federal Trade Commission

11
12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
13 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
14

15 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 INTERBILL, LTD., and THOMAS
19 WELLS, individually and as an officer or
director of InterBill,

20 Defendants.
21

CV-S-06-

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION
AND OTHER EQUITABLE
RELIEF

22 Plaintiff, the Federal Trade Commission (“the FTC” or “the Commission”), for its
23 complaint alleges:
24

25 1. The FTC brings this action under Sections 5(a) and 13(b) of the Federal
26 Trade Commission Act (“FTC Act”), 15 U.S.C. §§ 45(a) and 53(b), to obtain permanent
27 injunctive relief, rescission or reformation of contracts, restitution, disgorgement, and
28

1 other equitable relief in connection with defendants' unauthorized debiting of
2 consumers' checking accounts, which constitutes an unfair act or practice in violation of
3 Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

4
5 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

6 2. Subject matter jurisdiction is conferred upon this Court by 15 U.S.C.
7 §§ 45(a) and 53(b), and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1337(a), and 1345.

8 3. Venue in the District of Nevada is proper under 15 U.S.C. § 53(b) and 28
9 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c).

10
11 **PLAINTIFF**

12 4. Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission is an independent agency of the
13 United States Government created by statute. 15 U.S.C. §§ 41 *et seq.* The Commission
14 enforces Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), which prohibits unfair or
15 deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce. The Commission may initiate
16 federal district court proceedings by its own attorneys to enjoin violations of the
17 FTC Act and to secure such equitable relief as may be appropriate in each
18 case, including restitution for injured consumers and disgorgement of ill-gotten
19 monies. 15 U.S.C. § 53(b).

20
21 **DEFENDANTS**

22 5. Defendant InterBill, Ltd., is a limited liability company organized under
23 the laws of the British Virgin Islands. It is engaged in the business of providing payment
24 processing services to merchants, including those considered "high risk" by the payment
25 processing industry, such as online gaming and mail and telephone marketing.
26 InterBill's principal place of business is located at 3770 Bombastic Court, Las Vegas,
27 Nevada, 89147. InterBill engages in and transacts business in this district.

1 customer service and cancel within five days of receipt of the letter to avoid being
2 charged. By the time the consumers received the letter, their accounts had already been
3 debited. Most consumers did not even receive a letter, however, and their accounts were
4 simply debited without their knowledge or permission.

5 10. Using consumers' name and bank account information provided by the
6 Pharmacards perpetrators, defendant InterBill arranged for the production of "remotely
7 created checks," or "demand drafts," and submitted them for deposit into a designated
8 account in InterBill's name at Wells Fargo Bank. Demand drafts are paper checks
9 imprinted by a third party with the name and bank account number of a consumer, but
10 not signed by that consumer. Such drafts are deposited into the banking system and
11 processed like ordinary checks. Even though more than 70% of the attempted demand
12 draft transactions were "returned," or refused by the consumers' banks, more than \$2.38
13 million was debited from consumers' accounts and paid to InterBill.

14 11. InterBill agreed to process demand drafts for Pharmacards despite
15 indications that the operation was likely fictitious and that payments submitted for
16 processing by Pharmacards were not authorized by consumers. Indeed, at one point
17 the Pharmacards operators told defendant Thomas Wells that consumers were being
18 billed prior to receiving any information from Pharmacards. The fraudulent
19 Pharmacards scheme purported to offer U.S. consumers a discount prescription
20 benefits card but the Pharmacards operators did not provide the defendants with
21 references demonstrating experience with the U.S. prescription benefits field.

22 12. The Pharmacards principals provided a London, England mail drop as a
23 business address and conducted all their business by pre-paid, virtually untraceable
24 cellular phones and free, anonymous email and facsimile accounts. The Pharmacards
25 website provided a toll-free customer service number that was answered at a call center
26 in Montreal, Quebec, Canada and a fake address in British Columbia, Canada. Finally,
27 the Pharmacards operators used the identity of a Cyprus corporation and directed that
28 their funds be wired to a Cyprus bank account, a known tax haven.

1 13. InterBill failed to follow its own guidelines regarding the information to be
2 collected from new merchants prior to initiating processing for Pharmacycards. For
3 example, Wells, acting on InterBill's behalf, neither asked for nor checked business or
4 individual references. He did not obtain copies of the alleged direct mail offer. He did
5 not request or review information about the business' operations or its expertise in direct
6 mail or discount prescription offerings. He did not verify a physical address for the
7 individuals or the company.

8 14. From the start of its dealings with Pharmacycards, InterBill anticipated
9 high rates of returned or reversed transactions, a sign that unauthorized debits to
10 consumers' accounts were likely. In an email to one of the Pharmacycards operators,
11 defendant Wells stated that, "[g]oing into this project we discussed 40-45% being the
12 max [return rate] we could tolerate with this project." Despite the likelihood of high
13 rates of returned transactions, InterBill did not request or obtain proof that consumers
14 had authorized Pharmacycards to debit their accounts.

15 15. Shortly after beginning to process demand drafts on behalf of
16 Pharmacycards, defendant InterBill received additional information that Pharmacycards
17 was not a legitimate business and that the Pharmacycards transactions were, in fact, not
18 authorized. InterBill quickly began to receive consumer and bank complaints concerning
19 unauthorized debits, and rates of returned transactions sky-rocketed. InterBill also
20 learned of the high volume of unauthorized debit complaints from Pharmacycards'
21 customer service operation, a Montreal, Quebec company, Customer Care Relations,
22 operated by Neil Haboush.

23 16. Despite these early signs of problems with the Pharmacycards transactions,
24 InterBill continued processing demand drafts for the fraudulent Pharmacycards
25 operators.

26 17. Only belatedly, a month into processing, did defendant Wells ask the
27 Pharmacycards operators for information on the source of the database providing
28 consumers' checking account numbers, and request evidence that consumers had

1 received the packages for which they were billed. Even though Wells did not receive
2 answers to these questions, or received only incomplete answers, InterBill continued to
3 make unauthorized debits of consumers' bank accounts in the name of Pharmacycards.
4

5 **VIOLATIONS OF SECTION FIVE**

6 18. Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), prohibits unfair or
7 deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce. An act or practice is unfair if it
8 "causes or is likely to cause substantial injury to consumers which is not reasonably
9 avoidable by consumers themselves and not outweighed by countervailing benefits to
10 consumers or to competition." 15 U.S.C. § 45(n).

11 19. Defendants' acts and practices in processing debit transactions to
12 consumers' bank accounts, as described in Paragraphs 8-17 above, cause or are likely to
13 cause substantial injury to consumers which is not reasonably avoidable by consumers
14 themselves and not outweighed by countervailing benefits to consumers or competition
15 and, therefore, constitute unfair acts or practices in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC
16 Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

17 **CONSUMER INJURY**

18 20. Consumers throughout the United States have suffered substantial
19 monetary loss as a result of the defendants' unlawful acts or practices. Absent injunctive
20 relief by this Court, defendants are likely to continue to injure consumers and harm the
21 public interest.
22

23 **THIS COURT'S POWER TO GRANT RELIEF**

24 21. Section 13(b) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), empowers this Court to
25 grant injunctive and other ancillary relief to prevent and remedy any violations of any
26 provision of law enforced by the Commission.
27
28

22. This Court, in the exercise of its equitable jurisdiction, may award other ancillary relief to remedy injury caused by defendants' law violations.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiff, Federal Trade Commission, requests that this Court, as authorized by Section 13(b) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), and pursuant to its own equitable powers:

a. Enter a permanent injunction to prevent future violations of the FTC Act by defendants;

b. Enter judgment against defendants and in favor of plaintiff for the violations alleged in this Complaint;

c. Award such relief as the Court finds necessary and appropriate, including but not limited to, rescission of contracts, the refund of monies paid, and the disgorgement of ill-gotten monies and interest thereon by defendants; and

d. Award plaintiff the costs of bringing this action, as well as such other and additional relief as the Court may determine to be just and proper.

Dated: 12-26-06

Respectfully Submitted,
WILLIAM BLUMENTHAL
General Counsel



Tracy S. Thorleifson
Mary T. Benfield
Federal Trade Commission

Blaine T. Welsh
Assistant United States Attorney

Attorneys For Plaintiff
Federal Trade Commission